

Washington, D.C. 20505

14 January 1985

NOTE FOR: DDI

FROM: DCI

I like and support your draft letter
to Congressman Hamilton.

William J. Casey

11 January 1985

The Honorable Lee H. Hamilton
Vice Chairman
Joint Economic Commmittee
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

Your letter to me arrived just as I had finished preparing a letter to you as a member of both HPSCI and the Joint Economic Committee seeking your help on the question of omitting analysts names from reports prepared for the Joint Economic Committee. My original letter to you briefly reviewed the problem, enclosed a copy of Senator Proxmire's letter to the Director and asked for your support of the decision as a means of minimizing the risk to our analysts as well as reducing problems in arranging analyst travel overseas. In light of the questions in your letter, I would like to take this opportunity to respond at greater length than I had originally planned.

There were two reasons for my decision. As I mentioned in my letter to Senator Proxmire, the first reason is that the treatment of American officials aboard the Kuwaiti airliner represents the most vivid demonstration yet of the growing terrorist threat to American officials traveling overseas and made clear that CIA officers, in particular, are targets. The

JEC reports are widely circulated all over the world and read with particular interest by our principal adversaries. Given the known links between intelligence services in Communist countries and the suspected links between those services and various Middle Eastern terrorist organizations, it seems prudent (and probably overdue) to take additional steps to protect our analysts.

Second, we have had increasing difficulty both with the Department of State and our stations overseas in arranging analyst travel and extended stays abroad when those analysts have been prominently identified as CIA. We have actually had analysts denied the opportunity to travel to Eastern Europe for this reason. Thus, our attention initially was brought to this aspect of the problem by analysts themselves who were concerned that in writing for the JEC they were thereby being forced to forego future travel in Communist countries -- the areas of their specialities.

I do not believe that this decision will have a serious impact on our relationships or contacts with the academic community. Nor do I believe it is inconsistent with our participation in conferences and professional meetings in this country. We have expanded our contacts with the academic community dramatically over the past three years. Many of these contacts are on a one-to-one basis, with our analysts visiting professors or specialists in think tanks in their home institutions. These visits almost never are publicized. In 1984, some 1200 analysts attended nearly 500 conferences

sponsored by academic institutions or by other elements of the government with virtually no publicity.

In response to your specific questions:

- We do not believe that lack of identification of names will be a disincentive to analysts invited to prepare papers for JEC, particularly inasmuch as we attach priority to these papers. Analysts who seek public recognition generally do not find their way to CIA, where people work throughout their careers in substantial anonymity. Managers will see to it that analysts receive appropriate recognition internally for their contribution. And, we would allow analysts to acknowledge their JEC work if applying for other positions or in discussions with their professional peers.
- I would anticipate no diminution in the number of JEC papers prepared by CIA. Indeed, the same quality control, management review and dedication of resources are, and will continue to be, involved in the production of JEC papers as for CIA publications. We intend to let neither the quality nor the level of participation decline.
- Given the dramatically growing number of contacts between CIA officers and specialists on the outside, I

do not believe the change in approach to our identification in the JEC reports will diminish interaction with and constructive criticism from outside specialists. Continuing to expand these contacts is an important element of our ~~continuing~~ effort to improve the quality of our work.

- I am not in a position to judge whether academics will find it more difficult to evaluate papers who authors are anonymous; the work should, however, stand on its own.
- While some analysts may be disappointed that their names would not appear with their work in the JEC volumes, it is the judgment of managers in the Directorate that this will not have a significant impact. In any event, it will be largely offset by a greater sense of equity on the part of others who have contributed to preparation of these papers but whose names have not appeared.
- It is our judgment that our recruitment efforts will not be impeded, particularly as long as the papers are identified as being authored in CIA.
- As noted above, participation in panels, conferences and individual contacts involves little, if any, publicity, in contrast to identification of our analysts in the

authoritative JEC documents which are disseminated all over the world.

In closing, I return to the two ~~basic~~ and overriding considerations that were the basis for this decision. First and foremost we must be concerned for the safety of our analysts traveling overseas. While we cannot prevent occasional recognition of one or another of our analysts, the JEC reports represent the most visible such recognition in documents that we know are read by our enemies. Over time our participation is sufficiently broad that a high percentage of our specialists can be identified. Second, to the degree that public identification of our analysts in these reports is causing sufficient concern in our Embassies and Stations abroad to lead them to deny travel, ~~our overriding concern~~ ^{we} must ~~be~~ ^{try} to preserve these opportunities for the analyst. As I hope I have conveyed convincingly above, we do not intend to allow this decision to degrade or diminish in any way our participation in the JEC program.

SENATE

ROGER W. JEPSEN, IOWA,
CHAIRMAN
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., DEL.
JAMES ABDNOR, S. DAK.
STEVEN D. SYMMS, IDAHO
MACK MATTINGLY, GA.
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, N.Y.
LLOYD BENTSEN, TEX.
WILLIAM PROXMIRE, WIS.
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASS.
PAUL S. SARBANES, MD.

DAN C. ROBERTS,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LEE H. HAMILTON, IND.,
VICE CHAIRMAN
GILLIS W. LONG, LA.
PARREN J. MITCHELL, MD.
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CALIF.
DAVID R. OBEY, WIS.
JAMES H. SCHEUER, N.Y.
CHALMERS P. WYLLIE, OHIO
MARJORIE S. HOLT, MD.
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, CALIF.
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, MAINE

Congress of the United States

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
(CREATED PURSUANT TO SEC. 5(a) OF PUBLIC LAW 304, 78TH CONGRESS)

Washington, D.C. 20510

January 9, 1985

DDI-00160-85

Mr. Robert Gates
National Intelligence Council
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D. C. 20505

Dear Mr. Gates:

I would like to register my concerns about the proposal to omit the authors' names from papers prepared by CIA analysts for inclusion in Joint Economic Committee studies of the Soviet Union and other socialist economies.

First, the many papers prepared by CIA analysts for the JEC over the years, have been welcome contributions to an exercise whose purpose is to improve our understanding of the socialist economies, and to further research into these areas, by both government and non-government specialists. An important feature of the JEC studies is that they have promoted professional interactions between CIA analysts and the rest of the research community.

Before implementing the new proposals, we should ask ourselves the following questions:

1. Will the fact that CIA authors' names will no longer be identified be a disincentive to analysts who are invited to prepare papers?
2. Will far fewer, if any, papers be written as a result of the new policy?
3. If fewer papers are written for JEC publications, will an important source of information and analyses be lost to Congress and the general public?
4. If there are fewer papers, will the amount of interaction with, and constructive criticism from, outside specialists be significantly reduced, and will this adversely affect the quality of work done within the agency?
5. Will academics and non-government specialists find it more difficult to evaluate CIA papers whose authors are anonymous, and will they be inclined not to cite or rely on them in their own work?


Mr. Robert Gates
January 9, 1985
Page Two

6. Will the closing down of the opportunity to publish writings in JEC studies, under their own names, have a demoralizing effect on CIA analysts?
7. Will the agency's efforts to attract and retain high quality analysts be impeded?
8. How is the new policy consistent with the objectives stated in your December 12, 1984 article for the Washington Post, in which you discuss efforts to rebuild the corps of analysts, expand contracts outside government, and require CIA analysts to have outside training every two years?
9. How is the new policy consistent with the agency's practice of sending analysts to participate on panels and speak at meetings and conferences at universities and other public places?

I realize that the proposed change is motivated by concern about the safety of analysts who may be required to travel abroad. In some circumstances, withholding the name of an author may be justified. But a sweeping prohibition against identifying any author seems to me to go too far.

I look forward to your early response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Lee Hamilton", written over the typed name.

Lee Hamilton
Member of Congress